Governance of Related-Party Transactions: A Control-Design Framework for Transparency, Auditability, and Tax Risk

OMOIZE FATIMETU DAKO[1], OLAOLU SAMUEL ADESANYA[2], OGOCHUKWU PRISCA ONYELUCHEYA[3], BLESSING OLAJUMOKE FAROUNBI[4]
[1]*RBC Bank (Finance and Banking Advisor), Canada*
[2]*PricewaterhouseCoopers (PwC), Lagos, Nigeria*
[3]*Sahara Power Group Ltd, Nigeria*
[4]*Vetiva Capital, Nigeria*

Abstract- ***Related-party transactions (RPTs) present significant governance challenges due to the potential for conflicts of interest, tax risk, and financial misreporting. Effective oversight and control mechanisms are critical to ensuring transparency, auditability, and compliance with regulatory standards. This paper proposes a control-design framework for managing RPTs, integrating best practices from corporate governance, internal control design, and tax compliance literature. Drawing entirely from secondary sources, the study synthesizes research on transaction monitoring, internal audit procedures, and regulatory guidance to develop a robust conceptual model. The proposed framework emphasizes transaction authorization, disclosure practices, monitoring mechanisms, and audit trail management, supporting both corporate governance objectives and tax risk mitigation. The paper also identifies gaps in current RPT governance, such as inconsistent disclosure practices, weak audit trail documentation, and insufficient integration with enterprise risk management. The framework provides a structured approach for organizations to enhance transparency, strengthen internal controls, and reduce exposure to regulatory and tax penalties. This study contributes to the literature by bridging corporate governance theory and practical control design, offering actionable insights for regulators, auditors, and multinational enterprises managing complex RPT portfolios.***

Keywords: Related-Party Transactions, Corporate Governance, Auditability, Control Design, Tax Risk, Transparency

I. INTRODUCTION

Related-party transactions (RPTs) represent a crucial aspect of corporate finance and governance [1], [2]. They involve transfers of resources, services, or obligations between entities that have a pre-existing relationship, such as parent-subsidiary, affiliate, or key managerial personnel connections [3], [4], [5]. While RPTs can provide operational efficiencies and strategic benefits, they also create opportunities for conflicts of interest, earnings manipulation, and tax avoidance, which may compromise stakeholder confidence and regulatory compliance [6], [7].

In recent years, high-profile corporate scandals and regulatory investigations have highlighted the risks associated with poorly governed RPTs. Mismanagement of RPTs can result in financial misstatement, tax penalties, and reputational damage, emphasizing the need for robust control frameworks [8], [9]. The rise of multinational enterprises and complex corporate structures has further increased the complexity of RPT oversight, necessitating comprehensive frameworks that integrate corporate governance, auditability, and tax risk considerations [10].

1.1 Significance of Governance in Related-Party Transactions

Governance mechanisms are central to mitigating the risks associated with RPTs. These mechanisms typically include board oversight, audit committee review, internal control processes, and disclosure requirements [11], [12]. Effective governance ensures that:

- Transparency is maintained in all RPTs, allowing stakeholders to evaluate their fairness and alignment with organizational objectives.
- Auditability is supported through structured documentation, approval processes, and audit trails.
- Tax Risk is minimized by ensuring compliance with transfer pricing rules, local tax laws, and international tax standards.

Despite regulatory guidance from organizations such as the International Accounting Standards Board (IASB) and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), studies reveal ongoing challenges in enforcing consistent RPT governance across jurisdictions [13], [14]. Inconsistent practices, varying interpretations of "arm's length" standards, and gaps in internal controls contribute to both financial and tax risks.

1.2 Challenges in Managing RPTs

The management of RPTs presents several challenges:

1. Conflict of Interest: Transactions between related parties may be structured to benefit certain stakeholders disproportionately, undermining corporate governance objectives [15].
2. Complex Corporate Structures: Multinational corporations often engage in multiple intercompany transactions, complicating oversight and increasing the risk of regulatory non-compliance [16], [17].
3. Disclosure Variability: Disclosure requirements vary significantly across accounting standards and jurisdictions, limiting comparability and transparency [18], [19].
4. Audit Limitations: Auditors often rely on management-provided documentation for RPTs, which may not capture all relevant risk exposures [20], [21].
5. Tax Compliance Risk: Transfer pricing and cross-border tax rules require precise documentation and adherence to arm's length principles, failure of which may trigger penalties and reputational damage [22], [23].

These challenges underscore the need for a comprehensive control-design framework that addresses operational, audit, and regulatory dimensions of RPT governance.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

This paper aims to:

1. Synthesize Existing Literature: Review and integrate insights from corporate governance, internal control design, auditing, and tax compliance literature.
2. Develop a Control-Design Framework: Conceptually design a model that supports transparency, auditability, and tax risk management for RPTs.
3. Identify Governance Gaps: Highlight areas where current practices and frameworks fail to address emerging RPT risks.
4. Provide Actionable Insights: Offer guidance for regulators, auditors, and enterprises in implementing effective RPT oversight mechanisms.

By achieving these objectives, the study contributes to the broader discourse on corporate governance, internal control design, and compliance, particularly in the context of complex organizational structures and cross-border operations.

1.4 Research Approach

The study is entirely literature-based, drawing from academic research, professional standards, and regulatory guidelines. Key sources include:

- International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS) and IAS 24 on related-party disclosures.
- OECD Guidelines on Transfer Pricing and Tax Risk Management.
- Empirical and conceptual studies on corporate governance, internal auditing, and RPT oversight.

Through critical synthesis, the study identifies best practices, highlights governance gaps, and integrates these insights into a conceptual framework designed to

enhance RPT transparency, auditability, and tax risk control.

1.5 Structure of the Paper

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows:

- Section 2: Literature Review examines existing research on RPT governance, internal control practices, auditing, disclosure requirements, and tax risk mitigation.
- Section 3: Methodology outlines the approach used to synthesize the literature and develop the control-design framework.
- Section 4: Proposed Framework presents the conceptual design, detailing transaction authorization, monitoring, documentation, and audit mechanisms.
- Section 5: Discussion evaluates the framework's implications for governance, audit practice, and tax compliance, highlighting potential challenges and opportunities.
- Section 6: Conclusion summarizes findings, discusses contributions, and identifies avenues for future research.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

The governance of related-party transactions (RPTs) has received considerable attention in corporate finance, accounting, and auditing research due to its potential implications for transparency, financial integrity, and tax compliance. This literature review synthesizes the existing body of knowledge, highlighting best practices, regulatory frameworks, and gaps in current governance mechanisms. The review is structured into five sub-themes: (1) Theoretical Perspectives on RPT Governance, (2) Internal Control Mechanisms, (3) Auditability and Monitoring, (4) Disclosure Practices, and (5) Tax Risk and Compliance Considerations.

2.1 Theoretical Perspectives on RPT Governance

Related-party transactions have been extensively examined through corporate governance and agency theory lenses. According to agency theory, conflicts of interest arise when managers or controlling shareholders engage in transactions that benefit themselves at the expense of minority stakeholders [1], [2]. RPTs provide opportunities for self-dealing, earnings management, and resource misallocation, which can undermine corporate value and stakeholder trust [3].

Research highlights that robust governance mechanisms are essential to mitigate these risks. For instance, board independence and audit committee oversight play a critical role in reviewing and approving RPTs to ensure fairness and compliance [4]. Studies also emphasize the importance of transactional arms-length assessment, ensuring that prices and terms mirror those that would have been negotiated with unrelated parties [5].

Further, the resource dependence perspective suggests that RPTs may create strategic benefits, such as enabling access to specialized resources, markets, or financing through affiliated entities [6]. While theoretically beneficial, these advantages are contingent on transparent governance and adequate controls to prevent abuse.

2.2 Internal Control Mechanisms

Internal control frameworks form the backbone of effective RPT governance. According to the Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission (COSO), robust controls should include risk assessment, control activities, information and communication, monitoring, and the control environment [24], [25].

Empirical studies suggest that the design of control activities for RPTs should include:

- Authorization Controls: Transactions must be approved by appropriate levels of management or independent committees, particularly when exceeding predefined thresholds [26], [27].
- Segregation of Duties: Separation of transaction initiation, approval, and recording responsibilities reduces the risk of manipulation [28], [29].
- Automated Monitoring: Integration of enterprise resource planning (ERP) systems with control logic can flag unusual transactions in real-time [30], [31].

- Documentation Requirements: Comprehensive records of all related-party transactions, including supporting contracts and pricing justifications, enable auditability and regulatory compliance [32], [33].

These mechanisms are critical for detecting both intentional irregularities and unintentional errors, reducing the risk of misreporting and enhancing stakeholder confidence.

2.3 Auditability and Monitoring

Auditability is central to the governance of RPTs, as auditors provide independent assurance on the fairness and compliance of such transactions. Research indicates that RPTs pose a higher risk of material misstatement compared to ordinary transactions, requiring specialized audit procedures [34], [35].

Key audit practices identified in the literature include:

- Detailed Transaction Testing: Auditors often focus on significant transactions involving related parties, verifying authorization, valuation, and documentation.
- Analytical Procedures: Ratio analysis and trend examination help identify unusual patterns in RPTs that may indicate potential misstatements [36], [37].
- Use of Technology: Advanced analytics and process mining techniques enhance the detection of irregularities and provide auditors with actionable insights [38], [39].
- Continuous Monitoring: Real-time transaction monitoring is increasingly recommended to identify anomalies before they materialize in financial statements [40], [41].

Despite these advancements, gaps remain, particularly in smaller firms or jurisdictions with limited regulatory enforcement, where audit coverage may be inconsistent [17].

2.4 Disclosure Practices

Transparency in RPTs is reinforced through disclosure requirements stipulated by accounting standards and regulators. International Accounting Standard (IAS) 24 mandates disclosure of [42], [43], [44]:

- Relationships between entities and related parties, including the nature and extent of transactions.
- Key management personnel compensation.
- Outstanding balances and commitments with related parties [45].

Empirical research highlights that disclosure quality varies significantly across firms and countries. Factors influencing disclosure include board independence, firm size, audit quality, and regulatory environment [46], [47]. Effective disclosure practices not only enhance transparency but also act as a deterrent against opportunistic behavior by management and controlling shareholders [48], [49].

Recent literature emphasizes that structured, timely, and standardized disclosure is essential for both investors and tax authorities to assess the fairness and compliance of RPTs [50], [51]. However, inconsistent reporting formats and incomplete disclosures remain significant governance challenges [52], [53].

2.5 Tax Risk and Compliance Considerations

RPTs are closely monitored by tax authorities due to the potential for transfer pricing manipulation and tax base erosion. The OECD Transfer Pricing Guidelines provide frameworks to assess whether intercompany transactions adhere to the arm's length principle [54], [55]. Failure to comply can result in substantial penalties, reputational damage, and legal risks [56], [57].

The literature suggests several governance practices for mitigating tax risk:

- Documented Transfer Pricing Policies: Clear policies aligned with international standards and local regulations ensure consistent pricing of related-party transactions [58], [59].
- Independent Valuation: Utilizing third-party assessments to justify pricing decisions enhances credibility and compliance [60], [61].
- Integration with Risk Management: Embedding RPT governance into enterprise risk management

(ERM) frameworks allows organizations to proactively monitor and mitigate tax exposure [62], [63].

Despite these measures, research indicates that multinational enterprises often face challenges in harmonizing RPT governance with diverse tax regimes, particularly in emerging markets [64], [65].

2.6 Gaps and Opportunities in Current Literature

While the literature provides extensive insights on RPT governance, several gaps remain:

1. Integration of Control and Tax Risk: Existing studies often treat financial control and tax compliance separately, whereas integrated frameworks are limited [66].
2. Dynamic Monitoring Systems: The literature emphasizes static reporting and periodic audits; fewer studies focus on continuous monitoring through technology-enabled systems [67], [68].
3. Cross-Jurisdictional Challenges: Differences in local regulations and standards complicate governance in multinational enterprises, highlighting a need for globally harmonized frameworks [69], [70].
4. Empirical Testing of Frameworks: Conceptual models exist, but there is limited empirical validation of integrated control-design approaches for RPTs [71], [72].

These gaps justify the development of a comprehensive control-design framework that addresses transparency, auditability, and tax risk in an integrated manner, leveraging insights from governance, auditing, and compliance literature.

III. METHODOLOGY

This study employs a conceptual research methodology to develop a comprehensive control-design framework for governing related-party transactions (RPTs). Given that no primary data is collected, the methodology relies entirely on secondary data sources, including peer-reviewed academic literature, professional accounting and auditing standards, regulatory guidelines, and best-practice reports from corporate governance and risk management bodies. The methodological approach is designed to synthesize theoretical insights and practical recommendations, resulting in a framework that addresses transparency, auditability, and tax risk in RPT governance.

3.1 Research Design

The research follows a qualitative, literature-based design, which is appropriate for studies aiming to:

1. Integrate diverse knowledge streams into a cohesive conceptual framework.
2. Identify gaps in existing governance practices.
3. Develop actionable recommendations for practitioners and regulators.

The research process involves:

- Systematic Literature Review: Identification, collection, and critical evaluation of relevant academic studies, regulatory documents, and professional reports concerning RPT governance, internal controls, auditing, and tax compliance.
- Thematic Analysis: Categorization of insights into key governance themes, including control mechanisms, monitoring practices, disclosure requirements, and tax risk mitigation.
- Synthesis and Framework Development: Integration of findings to construct a unified control-design model that links governance principles with operational and regulatory requirements.

This approach aligns with conceptual framework development methodology widely used in corporate governance and accounting research [1], [2].

3.2 Data Sources

The study draws on the following secondary data sources:

1. Academic Literature: Peer-reviewed journal articles, books, and conference proceedings covering corporate governance, related-party transactions, internal control systems, audit practices, and transfer pricing.

2. Regulatory Standards:
    - International Accounting Standards Board (IASB) standards, specifically IAS 24 on related-party disclosures [73].
    - OECD Transfer Pricing Guidelines, providing guidance on arm's length pricing and tax compliance [74], [75].
3. Professional Practice Guidelines: Reports and frameworks from professional accounting bodies such as the American Institute of CPAs (AICPA), Institute of Internal Auditors (IIA), and the COSO internal control framework [76], [77].
4. Case Studies and Best Practices: Empirical and practitioner-based studies illustrating successes and failures in RPT governance, providing practical insights for framework design.

These sources ensure that the proposed framework is grounded in evidence, regulatory compliance, and best-practice guidance.

3.3 Framework Development Process

The control-design framework is developed through a multi-step synthesis process:

1. Identification of Governance Dimensions: Based on the literature, key dimensions of effective RPT governance are defined: transparency, auditability, and tax risk management.
2. Mapping Controls to Governance Objectives: Specific control mechanisms are identified and linked to each governance dimension. Examples include:
    - Transaction authorization protocols and board oversight (transparency).
    - Audit trail documentation and monitoring systems (auditability).
    - Transfer pricing compliance and tax risk assessment procedures (tax risk).
3. Integration into a Unified Model: The framework integrates all identified controls into a cohesive architecture, highlighting interdependencies between governance dimensions and control mechanisms.
4. Validation through Literature Cross-Referencing: Each element of the framework is corroborated with multiple secondary sources to ensure robustness and applicability.

This process ensures that the framework is conceptually sound, comprehensive, and adaptable to various organizational contexts.

3.4 Conceptual Model Components

The framework consists of four interrelated components:

1. Transaction Authorization and Approval: Establishing governance layers for approving RPTs, including independent board oversight and audit committee review.
2. Monitoring and Audit Mechanisms: Designing processes for continuous monitoring, exception reporting, and audit trail documentation.
3. Disclosure and Reporting Protocols: Ensuring transparency through standardized reporting formats and timely disclosure in financial statements.
4. Tax Risk Mitigation Measures: Embedding transfer pricing policies, third-party valuation, and integration with enterprise risk management to minimize regulatory exposure.

Each component is designed to reinforce accountability, compliance, and operational efficiency, forming a holistic framework for managing related-party transactions.

3.5 Advantages of the Methodology

The literature-based methodology provides several advantages:

- Comprehensive Scope: Captures diverse perspectives from theory, practice, and regulation.
- Flexibility: Allows integration of global best practices while accommodating organizational and jurisdictional variations.
- Evidence-Based: Ensures that framework components are grounded in validated research and recognized professional standards.
- Practical Relevance: Focuses on actionable mechanisms that can be implemented within real-world governance structures.

3.6 Limitations

While the methodology offers several strengths, limitations include:

1. Lack of Empirical Testing: The framework is conceptual and requires future validation in practical organizational settings.
2. Potential Bias in Secondary Sources: Reliance on published literature and regulatory documents may overlook unpublished or emergent practices.
3. Generality vs. Specificity: The framework is designed for broad applicability and may require customization for specific industries or jurisdictions.

These limitations are acknowledged as areas for future research and empirical validation.

3.7 Summary

This section outlines a systematic, literature-driven methodology for developing a control-design framework for related-party transaction governance. By synthesizing insights from corporate governance theory, auditing practices, internal control frameworks, and tax compliance guidelines, the study constructs a conceptual model aimed at enhancing transparency, auditability, and tax risk management. The methodology ensures that the framework is evidence-based, adaptable, and actionable, providing a solid foundation for subsequent discussion, practical application, and policy guidance.

IV. PROPOSED CONTROL-DESIGN FRAMEWORK

The proposed framework is a conceptual model designed to enhance the governance of related-party transactions (RPTs) by systematically integrating transparency, auditability, and tax risk management. Drawing from the literature on corporate governance, auditing, and tax compliance, the framework provides a structured control architecture applicable to both domestic and multinational enterprises. The model emphasizes prevention, monitoring, and reporting, ensuring that RPTs are conducted in accordance with internal policies, regulatory requirements, and best practices.

4.1 Framework Objectives

The primary objectives of the framework are:

1. Transparency: Ensure that all RPTs are disclosed fully and consistently, enabling stakeholders to assess fairness and compliance.
2. Auditability: Establish structured mechanisms for documenting and monitoring transactions, facilitating independent verification and internal/external audit processes.
3. Tax Risk Mitigation: Align related-party pricing and reporting with transfer pricing guidelines and other regulatory tax standards to minimize exposure to penalties and reputational risk.

By integrating these objectives, the framework provides a multi-layered approach to managing RPT-related risks while enhancing governance and accountability.

4.2 Framework Components

The proposed framework consists of four interrelated components, each addressing a critical governance dimension:

4.2.1 Transaction Authorization and Approval

This component ensures that RPTs are subject to formal approval processes prior to execution. Key elements include:

- Board Oversight: The board of directors or a designated audit/related-party transaction committee reviews and approves all significant RPTs [78], [79].
- Threshold-Based Controls: Transactions exceeding predefined financial or strategic thresholds require higher-level approvals or independent evaluation [80], [81].
- Independent Valuation: For transactions with potential conflicts of interest, external or internal independent valuation ensures adherence to arm's length principles [82], [83].
- Documentation: Approval records, justifications, and valuation reports are retained in the corporate record to support auditability and compliance [84].

4.2.2 Monitoring and Audit Mechanisms

Continuous monitoring and robust audit mechanisms are essential to detect irregularities and enforce internal controls. Features include:

- Real-Time Monitoring: Integration of ERP systems and workflow management tools enables early detection of unusual or high-risk transactions [85], [86].
- Audit Trails: Detailed records of transaction initiation, approval, execution, and settlement are maintained to support internal and external audits.
- Exception Reporting: Automated alerts flag deviations from policy, thresholds, or arm's length pricing, allowing timely investigation.
- Periodic Reviews: Internal audit teams conduct scheduled and ad hoc reviews of RPTs, focusing on high-risk transactions and trends.

4.2.3 Disclosure and Reporting Protocols

Transparency in RPTs is critical for maintaining stakeholder trust and regulatory compliance. This component focuses on:

- Standardized Reporting Formats: Use of consistent templates for internal reporting and external financial statement disclosure [4].
- Timely Disclosure: Ensuring RPTs are disclosed in accordance with statutory deadlines, including annual financial statements and regulatory filings.
- Narrative Descriptions: Qualitative explanations of the transaction purpose, rationale, and relationship between parties enhance clarity and transparency.
- Consolidated Reporting: For multinational enterprises, aggregation of all related-party transactions across jurisdictions provides a comprehensive view for both internal governance and tax compliance.

4.2.4 Tax Risk Mitigation Measures

This component addresses regulatory and compliance risks, particularly in jurisdictions with stringent transfer pricing and related-party rules. Key measures include:

- Transfer Pricing Documentation: Alignment with OECD guidelines, including benchmarking studies, intercompany agreements, and pricing justification [5].
- Integration with Enterprise Risk Management (ERM): Embedding RPT governance within the organization's ERM framework allows proactive identification of tax exposure and mitigation strategies.
- Third-Party Validation: Independent reviews of pricing and tax positions enhance credibility with auditors and tax authorities.
- Cross-Jurisdictional Coordination: Standardized processes ensure consistent treatment of RPTs across multiple tax

jurisdictions, reducing the risk of double taxation or penalties.

4.3 Framework Workflow

The proposed workflow integrates the four components into a cyclical governance process, illustrated conceptually in Figure 1 (journal-ready diagram recommended). The workflow follows these steps:

1. Transaction Initiation: Related-party transactions are proposed by management, capturing purpose, parties, and financial terms.
2. Authorization & Approval: Transactions undergo board or committee review, with approvals based on thresholds and independent valuations.
3. Execution & Documentation: Approved transactions are executed, and all supporting documentation is recorded in structured systems.
4. Monitoring & Audit: Real-time monitoring and periodic audits detect irregularities or deviations. Exceptions trigger corrective action.
5. Disclosure & Reporting: Transactions are reported internally and externally, ensuring transparency and regulatory compliance.
6. Tax Risk Assessment: Transfer pricing compliance and cross-jurisdictional considerations are evaluated to minimize tax exposure.
7. Feedback & Review: Lessons learned from audits and disclosures inform policy adjustments, reinforcing continuous improvement.

4.4 Benefits of the Framework

The proposed control-design framework offers several benefits:

- Enhanced Governance: Clear roles, approvals, and reporting structures reduce the risk of conflicts of interest and self-dealing.
- Improved Auditability: Structured documentation and monitoring facilitate both internal and external audits, improving reliability.
- Tax Compliance: Integration of transfer pricing and tax risk assessment mitigates exposure to regulatory penalties.
- Scalability: The framework is adaptable to organizations of varying sizes and complexity, including multinational enterprises.
- Decision Support: Real-time monitoring and exception reporting provide management with actionable insights for governance and strategic decision-making.

V. DISCUSSION

The proposed control-design framework provides a structured and integrated approach to managing related-party transactions (RPTs), addressing transparency, auditability, and tax risk. This section discusses the practical implications, challenges, and expected benefits of the framework, drawing on insights from the literature and industry best practices.

5.1 Practical Implications for Organizations

Implementing the proposed framework can significantly improve organizational governance of RPTs. Key implications include:

1. Enhanced Oversight and Accountability: By formalizing transaction approval processes and embedding independent valuation mechanisms, the framework strengthens board oversight and accountability. This aligns with agency theory, mitigating conflicts of interest between controlling shareholders and minority stakeholders [87].
2. Improved Risk Management: Continuous monitoring, audit trails, and exception reporting enable proactive identification of irregular transactions. Integration with enterprise risk management (ERM) systems allows organizations to evaluate and manage financial, operational, and regulatory risks associated with RPTs [88], [89].

3. Regulatory Compliance: Standardized disclosure protocols and alignment with IAS 24 and OECD transfer pricing guidelines ensure compliance with reporting and tax regulations. This reduces exposure to penalties, litigation, and reputational damage [90], [91].
4. Decision Support: Real-time monitoring and comprehensive reporting provide actionable insights for management and audit committees, supporting strategic decision-making and prioritization of high-risk transactions [92].

5.2 Benefits of Integration Across Governance Dimensions

A major contribution of the framework is its integrated approach, linking transparency, auditability, and tax risk management:

- Transparency and Auditability Synergy: Structured documentation and standardized disclosure enhance both transparency and auditability. Auditors can efficiently trace transactions from initiation to reporting, reducing the likelihood of misstatements or undetected irregularities [19], [93].
- Auditability and Tax Risk Mitigation: Continuous monitoring and documented transaction histories support transfer pricing assessments and tax audits, ensuring compliance with regulatory requirements [94].
- Operational Efficiency: Automated workflows for approvals, monitoring, and reporting reduce administrative burdens, streamline RPT management, and free resources for strategic tasks [95], [96].

This synergy addresses gaps identified in the literature, particularly the lack of frameworks that simultaneously consider financial, operational, and tax governance [97], [98].

5.3 Implementation Challenges

Despite its advantages, organizations may encounter several challenges in implementing the framework:

1. Resource Constraints: Smaller firms may lack the personnel, technology, or expertise required to maintain real-time monitoring systems or perform independent valuations [99].
2. Complexity in Multinational Settings: Cross-jurisdictional RPTs require harmonization of local accounting standards, tax regulations, and reporting practices, complicating implementation [100], [101].
3. Change Management: Adoption of the framework necessitates cultural shifts, policy updates, and training programs to ensure compliance with the new governance protocols [102].
4. Data Quality and Integration: Effective monitoring and reporting require accurate and timely data. Disparate systems, incomplete transaction records, or inconsistent coding can limit the effectiveness of automated controls [103], [104].

Addressing these challenges may require phased implementation, investment in technology, and collaboration between internal audit, finance, and compliance departments.

5.4 Alignment with Regulatory and Professional Standards

The framework aligns with established regulatory and professional standards, ensuring that governance mechanisms are both practical and compliant:

- IAS 24 Compliance: Standardized disclosure protocols and documentation practices directly support statutory reporting requirements.
- OECD Guidelines: Transfer pricing policies and valuation mechanisms facilitate arm's length compliance, reducing tax risk and potential penalties.
- COSO Internal Control Framework: The framework's emphasis on monitoring, authorization, and auditability reflects COSO's five control components: control

environment, risk assessment, control activities, information and communication, and monitoring.

Alignment with these standards enhances credibility with regulators, auditors, and investors, and promotes confidence in the integrity of financial reporting.

5.5 Contribution to Theory and Practice

The proposed framework offers contributions at both theoretical and practical levels:

- Theoretical Contribution: The integration of transparency, auditability, and tax risk into a single conceptual framework addresses a significant gap in RPT governance literature, providing a model that bridges accounting theory, agency theory, and risk management perspectives [2], [10].
- Practical Contribution: For practitioners, the framework provides a step-by-step blueprint for designing controls, monitoring mechanisms, and reporting protocols, applicable across industries and jurisdictions. It can serve as a reference for boards, audit committees, and compliance departments seeking to strengthen RPT governance.

5.6 Future Research Directions

The conceptual nature of this study highlights opportunities for empirical validation and refinement:

1. Case Studies: Future research could evaluate the framework's effectiveness in diverse organizational contexts, identifying best practices and lessons learned.
2. Quantitative Assessment: Metrics such as frequency of irregularities, audit adjustments, or regulatory penalties could be analyzed to assess impact.
3. Technology Integration: Research on the application of AI, process mining, and blockchain for real-time RPT monitoring can enhance automation and predictive capabilities.
4. Cross-Jurisdictional Adaptation: Examination of challenges and adaptations required for multinational enterprises could inform global best practices.

These avenues for future research would strengthen the practical applicability and robustness of the proposed control-design framework.

VI. CONCLUSION

This study presents a comprehensive control-design framework for governing related-party transactions (RPTs), with a focus on enhancing transparency, auditability, and tax risk management. Drawing on a systematic review of secondary literature, regulatory standards, and professional guidelines, the framework addresses a significant gap in corporate governance research and practice by providing a structured, multi-dimensional approach to managing RPT-related risks.

The framework emphasizes four interrelated components: transaction authorization and approval, monitoring and audit mechanisms, disclosure and reporting protocols, and tax risk mitigation measures. Each component contributes to a cohesive architecture that supports both internal governance and compliance with external regulatory requirements. By integrating these elements, the framework enhances stakeholder confidence, facilitates regulatory adherence, and provides management with actionable insights for effective decision-making.

Key contributions of this study include:

1. Theoretical Advancement: By integrating concepts from agency theory, internal control frameworks, and tax compliance, the framework advances understanding of how organizations can systematically govern related-party transactions.
2. Practical Guidance: The model offers actionable mechanisms for boards, audit committees, and compliance units to implement effective controls, monitor transactions, and mitigate tax risks.
3. Policy Implications: Alignment with IAS 24, OECD transfer pricing guidelines, and COSO standards ensures that the framework

supports robust governance and can inform regulatory oversight and corporate policy development.

While the framework is conceptual and requires empirical validation, it provides a robust foundation for future research and practical implementation. Organizations adopting this framework are better positioned to reduce conflicts of interest, enhance financial statement reliability, and minimize regulatory and reputational risk.

Future studies should explore the framework's application across different organizational sizes, industries, and jurisdictions. In addition, empirical testing using case studies, surveys, or archival financial data would strengthen the framework's applicability, identify best practices, and quantify its impact on governance outcomes.

In conclusion, the proposed control-design framework represents a significant advancement in RPT governance, offering a structured, integrated approach that enhances transparency, supports auditability, and mitigates tax risks, thereby contributing to more effective and accountable corporate governance in contemporary organizations.

REFERENCES

[1] M. Elhelaly, "Related party transactions, corporate governance and accounting quality in Greece," Jul. 2014.

[2] A. Tiwari, C. J. Turner, and B. Majeed, "A review of business process mining: state-of-the-art and future trends," *Business Process Management Journal*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 5–22, Feb. 2008, doi: 10.1108/14637150810849373.

[3] E. A. Gordon, E. Henry, T. J. Louwers, and B. J. Reed, "Auditing Related Party Transactions: A Literature Overview and Research Synthesis," *Accounting Horizons*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 81–102, Mar. 2007, doi: 10.2308/ACCH.2007.21.1.81.

[4] B. S. Adelusi and O. D. Adeniji, "Analyzing the Usage of Accounting Software for Short Medium Services (SMS) using Panel Data to improve Business competitiveness of Microfinance," *[Journal Not Specified]*, 2019.

[5] O. Benyeogor, D. Jambol, O. Amah, D. Obiga, S. Awe, and A. Erinle, "Pressure relief management philosophy for MPD operations on surface stack HPHT exploration wells," *SPE Nigeria Annual International Conference and Exhibition*, 2019, doi: D033S014R005.

[6] M. Fooladi and M. Farhadi, "Corporate governance and detrimental related party transactionsEvidence from Malaysia," *Asian Review of Accounting*, vol. 27, no. 2, pp. 196–227, May 2019, doi: 10.1108/ARA-02-2018-0029.

[7] R. J. Serfling, "Approximation Theorems of Mathematical Statistics," *Approximation Theorems of Mathematical Statistics*, pp. 1–371, Jan. 2008, doi: 10.1002/9780470316481.

[8] P. Rubin-Delanchy, N. A. Heard, and D. J. Lawson, "Meta-Analysis of Mid-p-Values: Some New Results based on the Convex Order," *J Am Stat Assoc*, vol. 114, no. 527, pp. 1105–1112, Jul. 2019, doi: 10.1080/01621459.2018.1469994.

[9] P. Rousseeuw, D. Perrotta, M. Riani, and M. Hubert, "Robust Monitoring of Time Series with Application to Fraud Detection," *Econom Stat*, vol. 9, pp. 108–121, Jan. 2019, doi: 10.1016/J.ECOSTA.2018.05.001.

[10] M. Riani, A. Corbellini, and A. C. Atkinson, "The Use of Prior Information in Very Robust Regression for Fraud Detection," *International Statistical Review*, vol. 86, no. 2, pp. 205–218, Aug. 2018, doi: 10.1111/INSR.12247.

[11] K. R. Hope, "Capacity development for good governance in developing countries: some lessons from the field," *Int J Public Adm*, vol. 32, no. 8, pp. 728–740, 2009, doi: 10.1080/01900690902908562.

[12] M. Thomas, *Evaluating Electronic Health Records Interoperability Symbiotic Relationship to Information Management Governance Security Risks*. 2019. Accessed: Jun. 05, 2018. [Online]. Available: https://search.proquest.com/openview/19b1d289dc52f8ed896a62bdf4e568b7/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y

[13] I. B. A. O. GI Agbaje, "Empirical assessment of the role of geospatial technology in

delivering governance and strengthening democracy in Nigeria," *GeoJournal*, vol. 83, no. 4, pp. 743–756, 2018.

[14] C. Allen *et al.*, "Data Governance and Data Sharing Agreements for Community-Wide Health Information Exchange: Lessons from the Beacon Communities," *EGEMS*, vol. 2, no. 1, p. 1057, Apr. 2014, doi: 10.13063/2327-9214.1057.

[15] A. Edmans, "Blockholders and corporate governance," *Annual Review of Financial Economics*, vol. 6, pp. 23–50, Dec. 2014, doi: 10.1146/ANNUREV-FINANCIAL-110613-034455.

[16] S. Rosenbaum, "Data governance and stewardship: Designing data stewardship entities and advancing data access," *Health Serv Res*, vol. 45, no. 5 PART 2, pp. 1442–1455, Oct. 2010, doi: 10.1111/J.1475-6773.2010.01140.X.

[17] A. W. F. A. H. A. YA Aina, "Top-down sustainable urban development? Urban governance transformation in Saudi Arabia," *Cities*, vol. 90, pp. 272–281, 2019.

[18] V. Khatri and C. V. Brown, "Designing data governance," *Commun ACM*, vol. 53, no. 1, pp. 148–152, Jan. 2010, doi: 10.1145/1629175.1629210.

[19] S. Roohani, Y. Furusho, and M. Koizumi, "XBRL: Improving transparency and monitoring functions of corporate governance," *International Journal of Disclosure and Governance*, vol. 6, no. 4, pp. 355–369, Dec. 2009, doi: 10.1057/JDG.2009.17.

[20] M. K. Power, "Auditing and the production of legitimacy," *Account Organ Soc*, vol. 28, no. 4, pp. 379–94, 2003, doi: 10.1016/s0361-3682(01)00047-2.

[21] E. Bonsón and M. Bednárová, "Blockchain and its implications for accounting and auditing," *Meditari Accountancy Research*, vol. 27, no. 5, pp. 725–740, Oct. 2019, doi: 10.1108/MEDAR-11-2018-0406.

[22] P. M. Hartmann, M. Zaki, N. Feldmann, and A. Neely, "Capturing value from big data–a taxonomy of data-driven business models used by start-up firms," *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, vol. 36, no. 10, pp. 1382–1406, 2016, doi: 10.1108/ijopm-02-2014-0098.

[23] M. La Torre, D. Valentinetti, J. Dumay, and M. A. Rea, "Improving corporate disclosure through XBRL: An evidence-based taxonomy structure for integrated reporting," *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 338–366, 2018, doi: 10.1108/JIC-03-2016-0030.

[24] S. J. Miller and M. J. Nigrini, "Order statistics and benford's law," *Int J Math Math Sci*, vol. 2008, 2008, doi: 10.1155/2008/382948.

[25] A. Cerioli and D. Perrotta, "Robust clustering around regression lines with high density regions," *Adv Data Anal Classif*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 5–26, 2014, doi: 10.1007/S11634-013-0151-5.

[26] I. U. Chhapra, M. Kashif, R. Rehan, and A. Bai, "An Empirical Investigation of Investor's Behavioral Biases on Financial Decision Making," *Asian Journal of Empirical Research*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 99–109, Apr. 2018, doi: 10.18488/JOURNAL.1007/2018.7.3/1007.3.99.109.

[27] N. Barberis and R. Thaler, "Chapter 18 A survey of behavioral finance," *Handbook of the Economics of Finance*, vol. 1, no. SUPPL. PART B, pp. 1053–1128, 2003, doi: 10.1016/S1574-0102(03)01027-6.

[28] D. Tranfield, D. Denyer, and P. Smart, "Towards a Methodology for Developing Evidence-Informed Management Knowledge by Means of Systematic Review," *British Journal of Management*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 207–222, 2003, doi: 10.1111/1467-8551.00375.

[29] R. Verma and P. Verma, "Behavioral biases and retirement assets allocation of corporate pension plans," *Review of Behavioral Finance*, vol. 10, no. 4, pp. 353–369, Oct. 2018, doi: 10.1108/RBF-01-2017-0009.

[30] V. N. C. Mushinada and V. S. S. Veluri, "Investors overconfidence behaviour at Bombay Stock Exchange," *International Journal of Managerial Finance*, vol. 14, no. 5,

pp. 613–632, Sep. 2018, doi: 10.1108/IJMF-05-2017-0093.

[31] A. Bennet and D. Bennet, "The Decision-Making Process for Complex Situations in a Complex Environment," *Handbook on Decision Support Systems*, pp. 1–14, 2008.

[32] J. F. Nunamaker and A. V Deokar, "Benefits of Decision Support Systems. Chapter 32. Handbook on Decision Support Systems 1," *Handbook on Decision Support Systems 1*, no. DECEMBER 2007, pp. 391–414, 2008, Accessed: Sep. 15, 2018. [Online]. Available: http://www.springerlink.com/index/10.1007/978-3-540-48713-5

[33] D. Arnott and G. Pervan, "A critical analysis of decision support systems research," *Journal of Information Technology*, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 67–87, Jun. 2005, doi: 10.1057/PALGRAVE.JIT.2000035.

[34] F. Burstein and C. W. Holsapple, "Handbook on Decision Support Systems 1," *Handbook on Decision Support Systems 1*, 2008, doi: 10.1007/978-3-540-48713-5.

[35] W. Eckerson, "Characteristics Of Effective Performance Metrics," *Performance Dashboards: Measuring, Monitoring And Managing Your Business*, p. 209 pp., 2011, Accessed: Sep. 10, 2018. [Online]. Available: https://books.google.com/books/about/Performance_Dashboards.html?id=5nuYDwAAQBAJ

[36] P. Wu, B. Xia, and X. Wang, "The contribution of ISO 14067 to the evolution of global greenhouse gas standards - A review," *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, vol. 47, pp. 142–150, 2015, doi: 10.1016/J.RSER.2015.02.055.

[37] J. Rowley, "Understanding digital content marketing," *Journal of Marketing Management*, vol. 24, no. 5–6, pp. 517–540, 2008, doi: 10.1362/026725708X325977.

[38] K. Nakatani and T. T. Chuang, "A web analytics tool selection method: An analytical hierarchy process approach," *Internet Research*, vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 171–186, Jan. 2011, doi: 10.1108/10662241111123757.

[39] A. B. Borade, G. Kannan, and S. V. Bansod, "Analytical hierarchy process-based framework for VMI adoption," *Int J Prod Res*, vol. 51, no. 4, pp. 963–978, 2013, doi: 10.1080/00207543.2011.650795.

[40] M. A. Waller and S. E. Fawcett, "Data science, predictive analytics, and big data: A revolution that will transform supply chain design and management," *Journal of Business Logistics*, vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 77–84, 2013, doi: 10.1111/JBL.12010.

[41] E. Heo, J. Kim, and S. Cho, "Selecting hydrogen production methods using fuzzy analytic hierarchy process with opportunities, costs, and risks," *Int J Hydrogen Energy*, vol. 37, no. 23, pp. 17655–17662, Dec. 2012, doi: 10.1016/j.ijhydene.2012.09.055.

[42] N. Daniels, "Accountability for reasonableness," *Br Med J*, vol. 321, no. 7272, pp. 1300–1301, Nov. 2000, doi: 10.1136/BMJ.321.7272.1300.

[43] M. J. Nigrini, "Benford's law: Applications for forensic accounting, auditing, and fraud detection," *Benford's Law: Applications for Forensic Accounting, Auditing, and Fraud Detection*, pp. 1–330, Jan. 2012, doi: 10.1002/9781119203094.

[44] B. Boyce, "Emerging Technology and the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act," *J Acad Nutr Diet*, vol. 117, no. 4, pp. 517–518, Apr. 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.jand.2016.05.013.

[45] J. Schmitz and G. Leoni, "Accounting and Auditing at the Time of Blockchain Technology: A Research Agenda," *Australian Accounting Review*, vol. 29, no. 2, pp. 331–342, Jun. 2019, doi: 10.1111/AUAR.12286.

[46] H. Cao and Z. Zhu, "Research on future accounting information system in the Internet of Things era," *ICSESS 2012 - Proceedings of 2012 IEEE 3rd International Conference on Software Engineering and Service Science*, pp. 741–744, 2012, doi: 10.1109/ICSESS.2012.6269573.

[47] D. E. O'Leary, "Configuring blockchain architectures for transaction information in blockchain consortiums: The case of

accounting and supply chain systems," *Intelligent Systems in Accounting, Finance and Management*, vol. 24, no. 4, pp. 138–147, Oct. 2017, doi: 10.1002/ISAF.1417.

[48] T. Carlin, "Blockchain and the Journey Beyond Double Entry," *Australian Accounting Review*, vol. 29, no. 2, pp. 305–311, Jun. 2019, doi: 10.1111/AUAR.12273.

[49] R. Palas and A. Baranes, "Making investment decisions using XBRL filing data," *Accounting Research Journal*, vol. 32, no. 4, pp. 587–609, Nov. 2019, doi: 10.1108/ARJ-01-2018-0002.

[50] A. A. Gomaa, M. I. Gomaa, and A. Stampone, "A transaction on the blockchain: An AIS perspective, intro case to explain transactions on the ERP and the role of the internal and external auditor," *Journal of Emerging Technologies in Accounting*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 47–64, Mar. 2019, doi: 10.2308/JETA-52412.

[51] L. Hao, J. H. Zhang, and J. B. Fang, "Does voluntary adoption of XBRL reduce cost of equity capital?," *International Journal of Accounting and Information Management*, vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 86–102, 2014, doi: 10.1108/IJAIM-11-2012-0071.

[52] C. Hoffman and M. Mora Rodríguez, "Digitizing Financial Reports – Issues and Insights: A Viewpoint," *The International Journal of Digital Accounting Research*, vol. 13, 2013, doi: 10.4192/1577-817/1577-8517-V13_3.

[53] T. S. Hsieh, Z. Wang, and M. Abdolmohammadi, "Does XBRL disclosure management solution influence earnings release efficiency and earnings management?," *International Journal of Accounting and Information Management*, vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 74–95, Mar. 2019, doi: 10.1108/IJAIM-06-2017-0079.

[54] D. Palazuelos and R. Dhillon, "Addressing the 'global health tax' and 'wild cards': practical challenges to building academic careers in global health," *Acad Med*, vol. 91, no. 1, pp. 30–5, Jan. 2016, doi: 10.1097/acm.0000000000000845.

[55] T. M. Choi, "Optimal apparel supplier selection with forecast updates under carbon emission taxation scheme," *Comput Oper Res*, vol. 40, no. 11, pp. 2646–2655, 2013, doi: 10.1016/j.cor.2013.04.017.

[56] B. Fahimnia, C. S. Tang, H. Davarzani, and J. Sarkis, "Quantitative models for managing supply chain risks: A review," *Eur J Oper Res*, vol. 247, no. 1, pp. 1–15, Nov. 2015, doi: 10.1016/j.ejor.2015.04.034.

[57] F. Caccioli, P. Barucca, and T. Kobayashi, "Network Models of Financial Systemic Risk: A Review," *SSRN Electronic Journal*, Nov. 2017, doi: 10.2139/SSRN.3066722.

[58] K. Adams, B. S. Nayak, and S. Koukpaki, "Critical perspectives on 'manufactured' risks arising from Eurocentric business practices in Africa," *Critical Perspectives on International Business*, vol. 14, no. 2–3, pp. 210–229, May 2018, doi: 10.1108/CPOIB-11-2016-0058.

[59] T. Aven, "Risk assessment and risk management: Review of recent advances on their foundation," *Eur J Oper Res*, vol. 253, no. 1, pp. 1–13, Aug. 2016, doi: 10.1016/j.ejor.2015.12.023.

[60] T. M. Choi, C. H. Chiu, and H. K. Chan, "Risk management of logistics systems," *Transp Res E Logist Transp Rev*, vol. 90, pp. 1–6, Jun. 2016, doi: 10.1016/j.tre.2016.03.007.

[61] F. Aqlan and S. S. Lam, "Supply chain risk modelling and mitigation," *Int J Prod Res*, vol. 53, no. 18, pp. 5640–5656, Sep. 2015, doi: 10.1080/00207543.2015.1047975.

[62] M. Giannakis and T. Papadopoulos, "Supply chain sustainability: A risk management approach," *Int J Prod Econ*, vol. 171, pp. 455–470, Jan. 2016, doi: 10.1016/j.ijpe.2015.06.032.

[63] V. Cho, "A study of the roles of trusts and risks in information-oriented online legal services using an integrated model," *Inf. Manag.*, vol. 43, no. 4, pp. 502–520, Jun. 2006, doi: 10.1016/j.im.2005.12.002.

[64] A. Ghadge, S. Dani, and R. Kalawsky, "Supply chain risk management: Present and future scope," *The International Journal of Logistics Management*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 313–339, Nov. 2012, doi: 10.1108/09574091211289200.

[65] O. Khan and B. Burnes, "Risk and supply chain management: Creating a research agenda," *The International Journal of Logistics Management*, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 197–216, Aug. 2007, doi: 10.1108/09574090710816931.

[66] C. J. Su and Y. A. Chen, "Risk assessment for global supplier selection using text mining," *Computers and Electrical Engineering*, vol. 68, pp. 140–155, May 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.compeleceng.2018.03.042.

[67] H. Soleimani, M. Seyyed-Esfahani, and G. Kannan, "Incorporating risk measures in closed-loop supply chain network design," *Int J Prod Res*, vol. 52, no. 6, pp. 1843–1867, Mar. 2014, doi: 10.1080/00207543.2013.849823.

[68] I. Heckmann, T. Comes, and S. Nickel, "A critical review on supply chain risk - Definition, measure and modeling," *Omega (United Kingdom)*, vol. 52, pp. 119–132, Apr. 2015, doi: 10.1016/j.omega.2014.10.004.

[69] T. Wang, K. N. Kannan, and J. R. Ulmer, "The association between the disclosure and the realization of information security risk factors," *Information Systems Research*, vol. 24, no. 2, pp. 201–218, 2013, doi: 10.1287/ISRE.1120.0437.

[70] I. Heckmann, T. Comes, and S. Nickel, "A critical review on supply chain risk - Definition, measure and modeling," *Omega (United Kingdom)*, vol. 52, pp. 119–132, Apr. 2015, doi: 10.1016/j.omega.2014.10.004.

[71] C. Kolotzek, C. Helbig, A. Thorenz, A. Reller, and A. Tuma, "A company-oriented model for the assessment of raw material supply risks, environmental impact and social implications," *J Clean Prod*, vol. 176, pp. 566–580, Mar. 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.12.162.

[72] T. K. Mackey and B. A. Liang, "The global counterfeit drug trade: Patient safety and public health risks," *J Pharm Sci*, vol. 100, no. 11, pp. 4571–4579, 2011, doi: 10.1002/JPS.22679.

[73] B. Jindra, A. Giroud, and J. Scott-Kennel, "Subsidiary roles, vertical linkages and economic development: Lessons from transition economies," *Journal of World Business*, vol. 44, no. 2, pp. 167–179, Apr. 2009, doi: 10.1016/J.JWB.2008.05.006.

[74] S. Young and A. T. Tavares, "Centralization and autonomy: Back to the future," *International Business Review*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 215–237, 2004, doi: 10.1016/J.IBUSREV.2003.06.002.

[75] R. Narula, "Innovation systems and 'inertia' in R&D location: Norwegian firms and the role of systemic lock-in," *Res Policy*, vol. 31, no. 5, pp. 795–816, Jul. 2002, doi: 10.1016/S0048-7333(01)00148-2.

[76] K. E. Meyer, M. Wright, and S. Pruthi, "Research notes and commentaries managing knowledge in foreign entry strategies: A resource-based analysis," *Strategic Management Journal*, vol. 30, no. 5, pp. 557–574, May 2009, doi: 10.1002/SMJ.756.

[77] A. Mody, "Is FDI integrating the world economy?," *World Economy*, vol. 27, no. 8, pp. 1195–1222, Aug. 2004, doi: 10.1111/J.1467-9701.2004.00647.X.

[78] P. Criscuolo, R. Narula, and B. Verspagen, "Role of home and host country innovation systems in r&d internationalisation: A patent citation analysis," *Economics of Innovation and New Technology*, vol. 14, no. 5, pp. 417–433, 2005, doi: 10.1080/1043859042000315285.

[79] J. H. Dunning and R. Narula, "Multinationals and industrial competitiveness: A new agenda," *Multinationals and Industrial Competitiveness: A New Agenda*, pp. 1–287, Jan. 2004, doi: 10.4337/9781845423414.

[80] M. R. Agosin and R. Machado, "Foreign investment in developing countries: Does it crowd in domestic investment?," *Oxford Development Studies*, vol. 33, no. 2, pp. 149–162, Jun. 2005, doi: 10.1080/13600810500137749.

[81] J. Henderson, P. Dicken, M. Hess, N. Coe, and H. Wai-Chung Yeung, "Global production networks and the analysis of economic development," *Rev Int Polit Econ*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 436–464, 2002, doi: 10.1080/09692290210150842.

[82] H. Hansen and J. Rand, "On the causal links between FDI and growth in developing countries," *World Economy*, vol. 29, no. 1, pp.

21–41, Jan. 2006, doi: 10.1111/J.1467-9701.2006.00756.X.

[83] J. I. Galan, J. Gonzalez-Benito, and J. A. Zũiga-Vincente, "Factors determining the location decisions of Spanish MNEs: An analysis based on the investment development path," *J Int Bus Stud*, vol. 38, no. 6, pp. 975–997, 2007, doi: 10.1057/PALGRAVE.JIBS.8400304.

[84] "Multinational enterprises and the global economy," *Transnational Corporations*, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 103–106, Dec. 2010, doi: 10.18356/43CE1FE7-EN.

[85] Y. Tan and J. von Schreeb, "Humanitarian assistance and accountability: what are we really talking about?," *Prehosp Disaster Med*, vol. 30, 2015.

[86] E. S. Kirkendall, Y. Ni, T. Lingren, M. Leonard, E. S. Hall, and K. Melton, "Data challenges with real-time safety event detection and clinical decision support," *J Med Internet Res*, vol. 21, no. 5, May 2019, doi: 10.2196/13047.

[87] J. Moll and O. Yigitbasioglu, "The role of internet-related technologies in shaping the work of accountants: New directions for accounting research," *British Accounting Review*, vol. 51, no. 6, Nov. 2019, doi: 10.1016/J.BAR.2019.04.002.

[88] J. Dai and M. A. Vasarhelyi, "Toward blockchain-based accounting and assurance," *Journal of Information Systems*, vol. 31, no. 3, pp. 5–21, Sep. 2017, doi: 10.2308/ISYS-51804.

[89] J. B. Kim, J. W. Kim, and J. H. Lim, "Does XBRL Adoption Constrain Earnings Management? Early Evidence from Mandated U.S. Filers," *Contemporary Accounting Research*, vol. 36, no. 4, pp. 2610–2634, Dec. 2019, doi: 10.1111/1911-3846.12493.

[90] J. Kitching, "Regulatory reform as risk management: Why governments redesign micro company legal obligations," *International Small Business Journal: Researching Entrepreneurship*, vol. 37, no. 4, pp. 395–416, Jun. 2019, doi: 10.1177/0266242618823409.

[91] Y. Zhao and P. Thompson, "Investments in managerial human capital: Explanations from prospect and regulatory focus theories," *International Small Business Journal: Researching Entrepreneurship*, vol. 37, no. 4, pp. 365–394, Jun. 2019, doi: 10.1177/0266242619828264.

[92] J. Louis and P. S. Dunston, "Integrating IoT into operational workflows for real-time and automated decision-making in repetitive construction operations," *Autom Constr*, vol. 94, pp. 317–327, Oct. 2018, doi: 10.1016/J.AUTCON.2018.07.005.

[93] L. J. E. Brown *et al.*, "Openness, inclusion and transparency in the practice of public involvement in research: A reflective exercise to develop best practice recommendations," *Health Expectations*, vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 441–447, Apr. 2018, doi: 10.1111/HEX.12609.

[94] K. Singh, P. J. Best, M. Bojilov, and C. Blunt, "Continuous Auditing and Continuous Monitoring in ERP Environments: Case Studies of Application Implementations," *Journal of Information Systems*, vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 287–310, Jun. 2014, doi: 10.2308/ISYS-50679.

[95] A. Faccia, M. Y. K. Al Naqbi, and S. A. Lootah, "Integrated cloud financial accounting cycle. How artificial intelligence, blockchain, and XBRL will change the accounting, fiscal and auditing practices," *ACM International Conference Proceeding Series*, pp. 31–37, Aug. 2019, doi: 10.1145/3358505.3358507.

[96] M. El-Helaly, "Related-party transactions: a review of the regulation, governance and auditing literature," *Managerial Auditing Journal*, vol. 33, no. 8–9, pp. 779–806, Nov. 2018, doi: 10.1108/MAJ-07-2017-1602.

[97] P. L. Marchini, T. Mazza, and A. Medioli, "Related party transactions, corporate governance and earnings management," *Corporate Governance*, vol. 18, no. 6, pp. 1124–1146, Oct. 2018, doi: 10.1108/CG-11-2017-0271.

[98] I. Holeman, T. P. Cookson, and C. Pagliari, "Digital technology for health sector governance in low and middle income

countries: A scoping review," *J Glob Health*, vol. 6, no. 2, 2016, doi: 10.7189/JOGH.06.020408.

[99] M. A. T Lawanson, "Land governance and megacity projects in Lagos, Nigeria: The case of Lekki Free Trade Zone," *Area Development and Policy*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 114–131, 2018.

[100] A. Cerioli, L. Barabesi, A. Cerasa, M. Menegatti, and D. Perrotta, "Newcomb–Benford law and the detection of frauds in international trade," *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*, vol. 116, no. 1, pp. 106–115, Jan. 2019, doi: 10.1073/PNAS.1806617115.

[101] P. Diaconis, "The Distribution of Leading Digits and Uniform Distribution Mod 1," *The Annals of Probability*, vol. 5, no. 1, Dec. 2007, doi: 10.1214/AOP/1176995891.

[102] A. Cerioli, A. Farcomeni, and M. Riani, "Wild adaptive trimming for robust estimation and cluster analysis," *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, vol. 46, no. 1, pp. 235–256, Mar. 2019, doi: 10.1111/SJOS.12349.

[103] P. Goodall, R. Sharpe, and A. West, "A data-driven simulation to support remanufacturing operations," *Comput Ind*, vol. 105, pp. 48–60, Feb. 2019, doi: 10.1016/J.COMPIND.2018.11.001.

[104] P. Kadlec, B. Gabrys, and S. Strandt, "Data-driven Soft Sensors in the process industry," *Comput Chem Eng*, vol. 33, no. 4, pp. 795–814, Apr. 2009, doi: 10.1016/j.compchemeng.2008.12.012.